

1

2

3

4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

5

6

GOPRO, INC.,

Case No. [19-cv-01004-SI](#)

7

Plaintiff,

8

v.

9

ALLIED SUNNY LTD., et al.,

**ORDER RE DEFENDANT'S MOTION
TO DISMISS**

10

Defendants.

Re: Dkt. No. 11

11

12

On February 22, 2019, plaintiff GoPro, Inc. (“GoPro”) filed a complaint initiating the instant action in the Northern District of California. Dkt. No. 1. On March 14, 2019, defendants filed a motion to dismiss for improper service, improper venue, and lack of personal jurisdiction. Dkt. No. 11. On March 28, 2019, GoPro timely filed an Amended Complaint as well as an opposition to the motion to dismiss. Dkt. Nos. 20, 21; see also *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(B)*. In its opposition, plaintiff explained that defendants refused to withdraw their motion to dismiss despite the filing of the amended complaint. Dkt. No. 21 at 2.

20

21

22

The original complaint has been superseded by the amended complaint and the Court will therefore deem the first motion to dismiss withdrawn. Defendants shall respond to the amended complaint no later than April 19, 2019.

23

24

IT IS SO ORDERED.

25

Dated: April 1, 2019



26

27

SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

28